



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

To: Special Programs Examiner Henry Yuen

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

From: Igor Troitski, first named inventor of applications No: 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121; 11/129,730; 10/751,325 and 11/023,115. Examiner: Maria Alexandra Elve

06/01/2009

Dear Special Programs Examiner:

From November 2009, I sent multiple notifications proving that the Office Actions produced by examiner Maria Alexandra Elve with respect to mentioned above applications do not comply with the USPTO rules and regulations.

I have received a reply only after my appeal to Acting USPTO Director mailed on 04/20/2008. This reply mailed on 05/07/2009 and signed by Robert Olszewski, Director Technology Center 3700.

Unfortunately, the Director did not take into account all presented arguments and made the conclusion that the Office Actions do comply with the USPTO rules and regulations, although:

1. **These Office Actions comprise pages which are the exact copies of the pages of previous Office Actions produced for applications which relate to other subject matters.** For example, pages from Office Actions with respect to applications No. 11/234,813 and 11/053,983 disclosing creation of images are used in Office Actions with respect to application No. 11/317,379 disclosing a method relating to laser show based on the destruction of lightweight objects.
2. **These Office Actions reject claims of an application by using the same references which have been already used for rejection of different claims of other applications relating to different subject matters.** For example, the Claims of not-final Office Action with respect to application No. 11/317,379 disclosing a method for destruction of balloons are rejected by using the references which have been used in applications No 11/234,813 and 11/053,983 disclosing the methods for creation of images.
3. **The final Office Action is considerably modified as against the non-final Office Action without any explanations in the final Office Action.** For example, the final Office Action with respect to application No. 11/317,379 mailed 12/29/08 eliminates the previous rejections, introduces new reference and new rejections as against the non-final Office Action mailed on 09/05/08 without any explanations.
4. **The examiner produces Office Actions and does not notice the physical effect which is the basis for the present applications.** For example, the examiner produced Office Actions with respect to applications No: 10/751,325; 11/023,115; 11/053,983 and did not notice that these applications use the laser-induced

breakdown phenomenon and corresponding terminology. The examiner noticed the term "laser-induced breakdown" only during production of Office Actions with respect to applications No. 11/317,379 and 11/234,819.

5. **These Office Actions reject Claims referring to the facts which are not used in the examined application.** For example, application No. 11/317,379 does not contain term "threshold breakdown". However, the non-final Office Action mailed on 09/05/08 rejects claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 referring to using term "threshold breakdown" in the present application. Applicants informed about this mistake in non-final Office Action, but the examiner repeats her false rejection in final Office Action mailed on 12/29/08.
6. **These Office Actions reject Claims by relying on terminological ignorance of the examiner.** For example, multiple U.S. Patents use term "laser-induced breakdown". However, the Office Actions with respect to application No. 11/317,379 mailed on 09/05/08 and 12/29/08 reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 referring to using term "laser induced breakdown" in the present application.
7. **These Office Actions form groups of claims so that the rejection is not equally applicable to all claims in the group.** For example, the non-final Office Action mailed on 09/05/08 with respect to App. No. 11/317,379 rejects all 19 claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crabtree IV (USPN 5,572,375). However, the group of claims includes claims 1-2, 4-15 & 19 disclosing destruction of the inflated balloons and cannot be rejected by Crabtree IV which describes only a method for image creation.
8. **These Office Actions contain only summary of U.S. Patents, which the examiner uses for rejections, and do not teach how the present claims are anticipated by these patents.** For example, the non-final Office Action mailed on 09/05/08 with respect to application No. 11/317,379 rejects all 19 claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crabtree IV (USPN 5,572,375) but does not teach how methods of destruction of lightweight object can be anticipated by methods of creation of images. This lesson is necessary, because rejected claims describe a method for destruction of objects, but Crabtree discloses a method only for creation of images.
9. **These final Office Actions make unsubstantiated statements that "applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive" without response to basic arguments.** For example, Response to Arguments of final Office Action mailed on 12/29/08 with respect to application No. 11/317,379 comprises examiner's justification of ignorance of used terminology and does not answer to any applicant's arguments concerning the incorrectness of the rejections.
10. **These Office Actions reject Claims under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over U.S. Patents which do not relay to the subject matter of the rejected claims.** For example, application No. 11/317,379 discloses a method for creation of laser show utilizing effects of laser interaction with inflated lightweight objects and using destruction of these objects. U.S. patent No. 5,572,375 discloses a method for creation of images and though, the non-final Office Action rejects all Claims of application No. 11/317,379 under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,572,375.
11. **These Office Actions reject present Claims referring to effects which are not relate to the subject matter of the present applications.** For example, Office Actions mailed on 09/05/08; 12/29/08 with respect to application No. 11/317,379,

disclosing the destruction of objects, reject all claims referring to "holography", "red, blue and green laser", "the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible "dot" at each change of refractive index", "secondary emission", and "rotating viewing surface" which are not relate to the destruction of objects.

12. The Office Action mailed on 04/17/2008 in answer to Request for Continued Examination mailed on 01/16/2008 with respect to application No. 11/023,115 coincides word for word with the final Office Action mailed on 08/21/2007 without any consideration of applicant's arguments stated in the Request.

13. The Advisory Action mailed on 02/04/2008 in response to the Request for Reconsideration mailed on 01/08/2008 with respect to application No.11/053,983 does not contain any consideration of applicant's arguments stated in the Request.

Applicants would like to emphasize that they do not seek the advocacy for their inventions, but as a customer, they have the rights to receive Office Actions which are clearly in compliance with the USPTO rules and regulations even in the cases, when the Office Actions reject of the presented claims.

Office Actions with respect to abandoned applications No: 10/751,325; 11/023,115; 11/053,983 are included in the consideration, because: 1) they comprise pages with coincide word for word with pages of applications No. 11/317,379 and 11/234,813; 2) they reject claims by referring the U.S. Patents, which used for rejection of applications 11/317,379 although they relate to different subject matters; 3) the corresponding Office Actions in answer to Requests for Continued Examination and for Reconsideration contain pages coinciding with applications No: 11/317,379 and 11/234,813 and do not reply to applicant's arguments, and 4) the examiner's admissions about her ignorance of "laser-induced breakdown", which is basis of these applications, were made in Office Actions, mailed on 09/05/08; 12/29/08 after abandonment of listed applications.

The Director's reply either ignores the arguments stated in the Petition or gives the evasive answers. For example, the Director interprets the use of the same pages in different Office Actions as using the same "language", and the use of the same U.S. Patents for rejections of different applications as the similarity of these applications. However, in both cases, he passes over in silence that one of these patents relates to the destruction of balloons by laser radiation but the other disclose methods for image creation.

Applicants respectfully request to give them your opinion concerning the compliance of all foregoing features of the Office Actions with the USPTO rules and regulations.

Respectfully submitted, by

Igor Troitski.



Enclosed: Analysis of the Director's reply (pages 4-12)



I. Criticism of the Director's Analysis of Offices Actions with respect to application No. 11/317,379

1. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Director's statement: "On pages 8-9 of the final Office action, the examiner also responded to the applicant's arguments filed on September 23, 2008".

The applicant's arguments filed on 09/23/08 contain multiple evidences proving that the examiner **has not met her obligations under 35 U.S.C. § 112, § 102 and § 103**. On mentioned pages, the examiner does not respond to these applicant's arguments but only tries to justify her misunderstanding of the basic terminology.

Consequently, the final Office Action makes unsubstantiated statement that "applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive". In effect, the final Office Action does not comprise the reply to basic applicant's arguments.

2. The applicants respectfully disagree with Director's ignoring of refers to only applicant's arguments filed on 01/22/09 after the final Office Action. These arguments are very important because the examiner made the fundamental modifications in the final Office Action as compared with the non-final Office Action without explanation of a reason:

- A) Final Office Action introduces new reference to Robbins (USPN 2,025,475);
- B) Final Office Action eliminates two rejections of all claims as being unpatentable over Crabtree IV (USPN 5,572,375) and Kuts (USPN 2,025,475) correspondingly.
- C) The Final Office Action introduces two new statements connecting with new reference.

The final Office Action does not explain the reasons of modification of non-final Office Action: the cancellation of the rejections containing in non-final Office Actions, appearance of new reference and new rejections in final Office Action.

3. The applicants respectfully disagree with that the Director does not comment the following fact (page 3 of the Petition): the non-final and final Office Actions with respect to the present application contain whole pages from Office Actions produced with respect to applications No. 11/234,813 and 11/053,983. It is necessary to emphasis: the present Claims disclose methods for destruction of inflated balloons but applications No. 11/234,813 and 11/053,983 describe methods for creation of images and fireworks.

Consequently, the Office Actions copy whole pages from Office Actions produced with respect to creation of images what does not relate to the destruction of inflated balloons.

4. The applicants respectfully disagree with that the Director does not comment the following fact: the non-final Office Action rejects claims of the application by using the same references which have been already used for rejection

of claims disclosing image creation and which do not relate to destruction of inflated balloons.

5. The applicants respectfully disagree with that the Director does not comment the following fact: the Office Actions reject all claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 referring to using in the application only two terms: "i) laser induced breakdown and ii) threshold breakdown"

Term "laser-induced breakdown" is the basic term of the subject matter and it is used in multiple U.S. Patents.

Consequently, the Office Actions reject Claims by relying on terminological ignorance of the examiner.

Term "threshold breakdown" is not correct and it is not used in the application. This application uses correct term "breakdown threshold", which is used in multiple U.S. Patents. Applicants informed to the examiner about this fact, but the examiner did not take into account the applicant's criticism and repeats the false rejection in non-final Office Action.

Consequently, the Office Actions reject Claims referring to fact which is not used in the present application.

6. The applicants respectfully disagree with Director's statement: "Petitioner asserts that the examiner failed to distinguish one claim from another claim in rejection. However, applicant has not stated why or how this is incorrect".

The petition contains (page 4, lines 1-3): "This Office Action (mailed on 09/05/08) does not examine a Claim and rejects all 19 Claims without distinguishing one from another even though some claims relate to the creation of images while others relate to the destruction of balloons by laser radiation". This single group of claims is rejected as being anticipated by Troitski (USPAP 2006/0175312 A1) which relates only to creating images and does not relate to the destruction.

Consequently, the Office Actions form groups of claims so that the rejection is not equally applicable to all claims in the group (this is the violation of MPEP § 707.07(d)).

7. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Director's statement: "Applicant has not provided rebuttal as to why the examiner's observations are not factual teachings from the reference for the examiner to be persuaded of any insufficiency in these observations."

The evidences stated on pages 3-8 of the petition demonstrate:

- A) The examiner gives a summary of Troitski (USPAP (USPAP 2006/0175312 A1) but does not teach how it is possible to destroy an inflated balloon by using Troitski (USPAP 2006/0175312 A1). This lesson is necessary, because Troitski (USPAP 2006/0175312 A1) teaches only how to create laser-induced images and does not teaches how to destroy inflated objects.

- B) The examiner gives summaries of Robbins (USPN 2,025,475) and Crabtree IV (USPN 5,572,375), and rejects presented claims as being unpatentable over these patents. It is obvious, the examiner should teach how the referenced patents can teach the destruction of an object by laser radiation if Crabtree IV describes only a method for creation of images and Robbins does not use laser radiation.
- C) The examiner gives summaries of Robbins (USPN 2,025,475) and Kuts (USPN 6,361,188), and rejects presented claims as being unpatentable over these patents. It is obvious, the examiner should teach how the referenced patents can teach the destruction of an object by laser radiation if Kuts describes only a method for creation of images and Robbins does not use laser radiation.

Consequently, the Office Actions contain only summary of U.S. Patents, which the examiner uses for rejections, and do not teach how the present claims are anticipated by these patents. This demonstrate that the examiner has not met her obligations under 35 U.S.C. § 112, § 102 and § 103.

8. The Office Actions reject present Claims referring to “holography”, “red, blue and green laser”, “the transparent multi-planar optical element, forming a visible “dot” at each change of refractive index”, “secondary emission”, and “rotating viewing surface” which are not used in the present application and do not relate to the destruction of an object by laser radiation.

Consequently, the Office Actions reject present Claims referring to effects which do not used in the applications.

Applicant’s conclusion: for the foregoing reasons, the Office Actions with respect to application No 11/317,379 are not clearly in compliance with the USPTO rules and regulations, because:

- the Office Actions copy whole pages from Office Actions produced with respect to creation of images what does not relate to the destruction of inflated balloons;
- the non-final Office Action rejects claims of the application by using the same references which have been already used for rejection of claims disclosing image creation and which do not relate to the destruction of inflated balloons;
- the final Office Action does not explain the reasons of modification of non-final Office Action: the cancellation of the rejections containing in non-final Office Actions, appearance of new reference and new rejections in final Office Action;
- the Office Actions reject Claims referring to fact which is not used in the present application;
- the Office Actions reject Claims by relying on terminological ignorance of the examiner;
- the Office Actions form groups of claims so that the rejection is not equally applicable to all claims in the group;
- the Office Actions contain only summary of U.S. Patents, which the examiner uses for rejections, and do not teach how the present claims are anticipated by these patents;

- the final Office Action makes unsubstantiated statement that “applicant’s arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive”. In effect, the final Office Action does not comprise reply to basic applicant’s arguments
- the Office Actions reject present Claims referring to effects which do not used in the applications.

II. Criticism of the Director’s Analysis of Offices Actions produced with respect to application No. 11/234,813

1. The Director states: “On pages 11-12 and pages 16-22 of the petition, in essence, petitioner requests a review of the following eight points. They are ...”

The applicant respectfully disagrees with presented list of the points because it does not include many important statements of the Petition, particularly, stated on pages 16 – 22.

2. The Director states: “A review of the non-final Office action of Sep 3, 2008 shows there are similarities of the Office action of Sep. 3, 2008 with the copending applications SN.11/317,379 and SN.11/053,983. However, this only proves that there are similarities in the scope of the current claimed invention and the claims of the copending application, SN.11/317,379 and SN.11/053,983. Therefore, there is nothing improper about using languages in rejecting the claims of the current application similar to the rejection of the claims in the related applications.”

The applicant categorically disagrees with this Director’s statement.

The Detailed Action of non-final Office Action of Sep 3, 2008 contain 6 pages from which 4 pages coincide with identical pages of Office Actions mailed on 09/05/2008 and 12/29/2008 with respect to application No. 11/317,379. It is necessary to emphasis: the present Claims disclose methods for producing fireworks but application No. 11/317,379 describes methods for destruction of inflated balloons. Therefore, Director’s arguments of “languages” and “similarities” are not correct.

It is applicant’s opinion that copying whole pages from Office Actions and using them in other Office Actions with respect to different subject matters cannot be clearly in compliance with the USPTO rules and regulations.

3. The Director states: “In the petition, petitioner also states that the examiner did not examine any claims in the Office action of Sep. 3, 2008. However, petitioner fails to indicate exact limitations, if any, from the claims that the examiner failed to consider.”

The claims that the examiner failed are obvious from the Office Actions. For example, the examiner without consideration of the claims disclosing the use of laser-induced breakdown (Claims 1, 6, 8 and 9) included them in the group of claims: (1-9 & 11-12) which is rejected as anticipated by or, in the alternative, as obvious over Crabtree IV (USPN 5,572,375), although Crabtree IV does not use the breakdown phenomenon.

It is applicant’s opinion, that the examiner included Claims 1, 6, 8 and 9 in the mentioned group because she did not consider these claims.

4. The Director states that "A review of the Office action of Sep. 3, 2009 shows that the examiner did in fact set forth observations as to how the references are reading on the claims. In each group of the rejections of the claims, the rejection is equally applicable to other claims."

The applicants respectfully disagree with this statement.

For example, Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuts (USPN 6,361,188). However, the group of Claims 13 -20 includes Claim 13 and 17 teaching how to create different "laser-material interaction effects" by using laser-induced breakdown but Kuts does not use laser-induced breakdown and therefore the rejection is not equally applicable to other claims of this group.

For the foregoing reasons, the Director's statement "it is not seen that the examiner has not met her obligations under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 and § 112" seems to be incorrect.

5. The applicant's arguments filed on November 3, 2008 contain multiple evidences proving that all rejections of the present claims made in the non-final Office Action are incorrect. On pages 8 (lines 1-12) of the final Office Action mailed on 03/17/2009, the examiner does not respond to these applicant's arguments but only tries to explain why she does not accept term "laser-induced breakdown" although this term has been used in multiple U.S. Patents.

Hereby, the examiner statement that "Applicant's arguments filed 11/6/08 have been fully considered" is unfounded statement.

Applicant's Conclusion:

For the foregoing reasons the Office Actions with respect to application No. 11/234,813 cannot be "clearly in compliance with the USPTO rules and regulations".

III. Offices Actions produced with respect to application No. 11/108,121

The Director states that "after the review of the non-final Office action of Jan. 2, 2009, the examiner's Office action does comply with the USPTO rules and regulations".

The ground of this conclusion is the following:

- 1) the examiner divides all present claims into two groups: 1-34 & 37-40 and 1-2 & 5-40;
- 2) the examiner gives the copies of the summary of U.S. patents which the examiner uses for rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a).

The applicants respectfully disagree with both the Director's arguments and his decision because forming the group does not comply with MPEP §707.07(d) and copying of summaries of U.S. patents without teaching how the present Claims are anticipated by the referenced patents does not comply with the USPTO rules and regulations.

Detailed Action of this Office Action contains only about 40 lines, (what is equal to the number of examined Claims) from which 28 lines (6-12, 14-20, 24-40) describe referenced patents by twice. The rest lines are typical for any Office Action. Not a line teaches how the examined 40 claims are anticipated by the referenced patents.

As a result of such quick production:

- A) The examiner does not explain the concept of forming the groups of claims.
- B) The examiner rejects present claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatented over Troitski (USPN 6,664,501) or Troitski (6,399,914). However, the "Background of the invention" of the present application has made references to **both these patents** and it has been already demonstrated the reasons why the presented methods cannot be anticipated by these patents. **The examiner and the Director ignore this applicant's conclusion without any explanation.**
- C) The examiner rejects Claims 1-34 & 37-40 by describing Troitski (USPN 6,664,501) and Claims 1-2 & 5-40 by referring to Troitski (USPN 6,399,914) but does not explain why and how these patents can be useful for creating images by melting, vaporization, material removal by shock waves and photoionization, **if these patents do not use these physical phenomena.**
- D) The examiner does not give any comparative analysis of present methods and methods of Troitski (USPN 6,664,501) or Troitski (USPN 6,399,914). In principle, the examiner could use (equally well!) any other U.S. patent which contain words "laser" and "image" instead of Troitski (USPN 6,664,501) and Troitski (USPN 6,399,914).
- E) The group of Claims 1-34 & 37-40 includes claims which disclose methods working for **any transparent and opaque materials by using melting, vaporization, material removal by shock waves, laser-induced breakdown and photoionization.** The Director copying the summary of Troitski (USPN 6,664,501) saw that Troitski (USPN 6,664,501) works only for very special photosensitive glass and creates images by using only laser-induced breakdown. Therefore, Troitski (USPN 6,664,501) **cannot teaches how to produce images inside transparent materials** which are not photosensitive glass and how to create images on opaque materials by using melting, vaporization, material removal by shock waves, and photoionization. Consequently, the group of Claims 1-34 & 37-40 cannot be anticipated by Troitski (USPN 6,664,501) and moreover, the examiner infringes MPEP §707.07(d) which does permit grouping of claims in a common rejection only if the rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the group.
- F) The group of claims 1-2 & 5-40 include claims which **disclose methods for creating images by using melting, vaporization, material removal by shock waves, and photoionization.** Troitski (USPN 6,399,914) does not use these effects. Consequently, the group of Claims 1-34 & 37-40 cannot be anticipated by Troitski (USPN 6,399,914) and moreover, the examiner infringes MPEP §707.07(d) which does permit grouping of claims in a common rejection only if the rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the group.

Applicant's Conclusion:

For the foregoing reasons the Office Actions with respect to application No. 11/234,813 cannot be “clearly in compliance with the USPTO rules and regulations”.

IV. Director’s Response does not comment that the Office Actions with respect to applications No. 10/751,325; 11/023,115; 11/053,983 were produced by the examiner, who did not notice that these application are based on the laser-induced breakdown phenomenon and that they use corresponding terminology:

1. Evidences that applications No: 10/751,325; 11/023,115; 11/053,983 are based on **laser-induced breakdown** phenomenon and that this term is used in these applications:
 - a) Application No. 11/053,983 states: “The principal concepts of the invention are based on the following pieces of evidence of laser-induced breakdown in gases: 1) the **laser-induced breakdown** is generated at the focal area of pulsed laser radiation.....” (Page 12);
 - b) application No 10/751,325 states: “ ... all laser-induced damages can be produced by laser-induced breakdown without internal crash of a transparent material” (Abstract);
 - c) application No 11/023, 115 states: “The first kind of the marks are created by laser-induced breakdowns, the second kind of marks (color centers) are arisen as a result of photo ionization” (Second paragraph of Detailed Description of the Invention).
2. Term **“laser-induced breakdown”** also was not noticed by the examiner in the U.S. Patents No: 6,399,914; 6,490,299; 6,509,548 which are described in application No 10/751,325; U.S. Patents No: 6,399,914; 6,664,501; 6,670,576; 6,740,848 which are described in application No 11/023,115 and U.S. Patents No: 6,399,914; 6,490,299; 6,509,548; 6,664,501; 6,670,576; 6,740,846; 6,768,081 which are described in application No 11/053,983. All listed applications use laser-induced breakdown phenomenon and the term **“laser-induced breakdown”**.
3. First, the examiner noticed the term **“laser-induced breakdown”** only in applications No: 11/317,379 and 11/234,813 and decided that “one skilled in the art” will not be able to understand the presented inventions, particularly, because of the applications use the term. Using terms: “i) **laser induced breakdown** and ii) **threshold breakdown**” is the reason of rejection of presented claims in application No.11/317,379 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
4. The examiner did not notice that the applications No: 11/317,379 and 11/234,813 contain references to U.S. Patents No. 6,399,914; 6,490,299; 6,509,548; 6,664,501; 6,670,576 and 6,768,081 which use the term **“laser-induced breakdown”**.

5. The examiner did not carefully read the examined applications and referenced U.S. Patents (for example, No: 6,417,485; 6,426,480; 6,720,521; 6,720,523; 6,734,389; 6,768,080) which use term "breakdown threshold". As a result, the examiner used the term "threshold breakdown" (Office Actions with respect to application No. 11/317,379) instead of correct term "breakdown threshold".

V. Application No. 11/129,730.

This application is based on laser-induced breakdown phenomenon: the term "laser-induced breakdown" is used 17 times and the term "breakdown threshold" is used 23 times. Taking into account that examiner Maria Alexandra Elve does not know these terms, applicant respectfully requested in the letter mailed on 02/09/2009 that the present application would be examined by an examiner who knows the corresponding terminology. Unfortunately, the applicant has again received the non-final Office Action (mailed on 04/30/2009) produced by Maria Alexandra Elve.

VI. Office Actions mailed on 09/21/2007 and 12/31/2007 with respect to application No. 11/053,983

1. The Detailed Action of the non-final Office Actions mailed on 09/21/2007 comprises 3.5 pages from which 2 pages coincide with pages of Office Actions with respect to applications No. 11/234,813 and 11/317,379. It is important; that the present application discloses creation of images but application No. 11/317,379 discloses a method for destruction of lightweight objects.
2. The Office Action mailed on 12/31/2007 contains pages which coincide word for word with some pages of Office Actions mailed on 09/03/08; 09/05/08; 12/29/08 with respect to applications No. 11/234,813 and 317,379. It is important; that the present application discloses creation of images but application No. 11/317,379 discloses a method for destruction of lightweight objects.
3. The Office Actions reject claims of the application by using the same references which are used for rejection of claims of application No. 11/234,813 and 317,379. It is important; that the present application discloses creation of images but application No. 11/317,379 discloses a method for destruction of lightweight objects.
4. The Advisory Action mailed on 02/04/2008 in response to the Request for Reconsideration mailed on 01/08/2008 with respect to application No.11/053,983 does not contain any consideration of applicant's arguments stated in the Request.
5. The Office Actions reject all presented Claims 15-24 as single group however the made rejection is not equally applicable to all claims in the group. For example, Claims 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 teach to create images by laser breakdown but Crabtree IV (USPN 5,572,375) do not use laser-induced breakdown therefore

these claims cannot be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Crabtree IV. This is obvious violation of MPEP § 707.07(d).

6. The Office Actions contain only summary of U.S. Patent No. 5,572,375, which the examiner uses for rejections, but do not teach how the present claims, disclosing creation of images by generating laser breakdowns, can be anticipated by this patents if they do not use the laser-induced breakdown.

Conclusion: For the foregoing reasons the Office Actions with respect to application No. 11/053,983 cannot be "clearly in compliance with the USPTO rules and regulations".

VII. Director's Response does not comment that the Office Actions with respect to applications No. 10/751,325; 11/317,379; 11/234,813; 11/053,983; 11/108,121; 11/129,730 and 11/023,115 contain false statements. Corresponding examples were presented on pages 21-22 of the Petition.

Respectfully submitted by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Troitski', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

Igor Troitski